



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,913	09/14/2006	Jurgen Adams	78857.105106	1985
86528	7590	08/31/2010		
King & Spalding LLP 401 Congress Avenue Suite 3200 Austin, TX 78701			EXAMINER	
			GUILLEMETY, FRED	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2625		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/31/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AustinUSPTO@kslaw.com
AustinIP@kslaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/598,913	Applicant(s) ADAMS, JURGEN
	Examiner Fred Guillermety	Art Unit 2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 4,5,9-12,14-17 and 19-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 4,5,9-12,14-17 and 19-28 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 June 2010 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner Notes

- 1.** The Examiner cites particular columns, line numbers, and/or paragraphs in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, Applicant fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.
- 2.** In view of the aforementioned, it is respectfully requested that Applicant reciprocate the courtesies extended by the Examiner and cite specific support from the specification when amending claims. The Examiner appreciates Applicant's good faith and diligence in this matter.

Claim Notes

- 3.** With respect to **claims 4, 5, 9-12, and 14-17**, a series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

It is respectfully requested that Applicant ensure that dependent claims depend on preceding claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2625

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 19, 21-24, 26-28, 9, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 ("Mutz") in view of US 6,633,393 ("Fukano").

With respect to claim 19, Mutz discloses a motor vehicle tachograph printer for printing on a print medium (*see abstract*), comprises:

a printing unit for printing on the print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least printing driver 27*);

[...];

[...]; and

[...].

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose

a conveying drive for moving the print medium in and out of the printer;

at least one sensor for reading a print configuration design associated with the print medium, wherein the print configuration design specifies a desired print configuration used by the printing unit; and

a control unit coupled to the printing unit, the conveying unit and the at least one sensor, wherein the control unit determines from the at least one sensor the print configuration design associated with the print medium, whereby the control unit applies the desired print configuration to a specific content of a printout that is printed onto the print medium.

However, Mutz does disclose that the printer has a sensor to detect the presence of the print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least switch 29*) and that this information is sent to a control unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least microprocessor 23*). While the exemplary embodiment disclosed by Mutz presumably uses a print medium with the same layout each time and only on one side, it is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that a more versatile print system is envisioned without departing from the

spirit and scope of Mutz's disclosure (*col. 11, lines 6-9*). Consider at least the teachings of Fukano.

Fukano, working in the same field of endeavor, discloses a conveying drive for moving the print medium in and out of the printer (*col. 6, line 57 to col. 7, line 6 – see at least form transportation mechanism*); at least one sensor (*col. 12, lines 30-38 – see at least detector (A)*) for reading a print configuration design associated with the print medium (see *at least notched edges of Fig. 12*), wherein the print configuration design specifies a desired print configuration used by the printing unit (*col. 1, lines 8-21 – different information must appropriately be printed to the front or back side*); and

a control unit (*col. 6, lines 15-24 – see at least controller 204*) coupled to the printing unit, the conveying unit and the at least one sensor, wherein the control unit determines from the at least one sensor the print configuration design associated with the print medium, whereby the control unit applies the desired print configuration to a specific content of a printout that is printed onto the print medium (*col. 11, lines 30-55 – see at least steps S1109 and S1110*).

This arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing on the wrong side (*col. 14, lines 35-42*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

With respect to claim 21, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 19, further comprising:

operating elements coupled to the control unit, wherein the operating elements are used to input information into the control unit (*col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least keyboard 11, keys 12-17*);

a display panel coupled to the control unit, the display panel adapted for displaying information from the control unit to a user (col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least *display device 8*);

a vehicle parameter interface to the motor vehicle, the vehicle parameter interface supplying vehicle operating information to the control unit (col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least *interface circuit 30*); and

a communications interface coupled to the control unit (col. 4, lines 39-64 – see at least *data bus 18, address bus 19, control bus 20, interfaces 28, 30, 31, 32, etc.*).

With respect to claim 22, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 19.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the print configuration design is a printed pattern on and biased toward at least one edge of the print medium.

Fukano, working in the same field of endeavor, discloses wherein the print configuration design is a printed pattern (col. 4, lines 39-45 – *printed patterns include markings such as magnetic ink characters and bar codes*) on and biased toward at least one edge of the print medium (col. 1, lines 36-42 – *MICR text is printed in standardized locations would be biased towards at least one edge or another*).

This arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing on the wrong side (col. 14, lines 35-42).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

With respect to claim 23, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 19.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the print configuration design is a cutout pattern in at least one edge of the print medium.

Fukano, working in the same field of endeavor, discloses wherein the print configuration design is a cutout pattern in at least one edge of the print medium (see *at least notched edges of Fig. 12*).

This arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing on the wrong side (*col. 14, lines 35-42*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

With respect to claim 24, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 19, wherein the print medium is a paper print medium (*col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least sheet-type print carrier 3*).

With respect to claim 26, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 24, wherein the paper print medium is a paper card (*col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least sheet-type print carrier 3*).

With respect to claim 27, Mutz discloses a method for printing on a print medium with a motor vehicle tachograph printer (*see abstract*), comprising the steps of: printing on the print medium with a printing unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least printing driver 27*);

[...];

[...];

[...]; and

[...].

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose moving the print medium in and out of the printer unit with a conveying drive; reading a print configuration design on the print medium with at least one sensor, wherein the print configuration design specifies a desired print configuration used by the printing unit;

determining from the at least one sensor the print configuration design on the print medium with a control unit; and

printing a specific content of a printout onto the print medium using the desired print configuration according to the print configuration design determined with the control unit.

However, Mutz does disclose that the printer has a sensor to detect the presence of the print medium (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least switch 29*) and that this information is sent to a control unit (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least microprocessor 23*). While the exemplary embodiment disclosed by Mutz presumably uses a print medium with the same layout each time and only on one side, it is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that a more versatile print system is envisioned without departing from the spirit and scope of Mutz's disclosure (*col. 11, lines 6-9*). Consider at least the teachings of Fukano.

Fukano, working in the same field of endeavor, discloses moving the print medium in and out of the printer unit with a conveying drive (*col. 6, line 57 to col. 7, line 6 – see at least form transportation mechanism*);

reading a print configuration design on the print medium (*see at least notched edges of Fig. 12*) with at least one sensor (*col. 12, lines 30-38 – see at least detector (A)*), wherein the print configuration design specifies a desired print configuration used by the printing unit (*col. 1, lines 8-21 – different information must appropriately be printed to the front or back side*);

determining from the at least one sensor the print configuration design on the print medium (*col. 11, lines 30-55 – see at least steps S1109 and S1110*) with a control unit (*col. 6, lines 15-24 – see at least controller 204*); and

printing a specific content of a printout onto the print medium using the desired print configuration according to the print configuration design determined with the control unit (*col. 1, lines 8-21 – different information must appropriately be printed to the front or back side*).

This arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing on the wrong side (*col. 14, lines 35-42*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

With respect to claim 28, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 27, further comprising the steps of:

inputting information into the control unit with operating elements coupled to the control unit (*col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least keyboard 11, keys 12-17*);

displaying information from the control unit to a user with a display panel (*col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least display device 8*);

supplying vehicle operating information to the control unit with a vehicle parameter interface (*col. 4, lines 39-63 – see at least interface circuit 30*); and

communicating with the control unit through a communications interface (*col. 4, lines 39-64 – see at least data bus 18, address bus 19, control bus 20, interfaces 28, 30, 31, 32, etc.*).

With respect to claim 9, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 27, wherein the tachograph printer has an insertion opening into which the print medium is inserted for printing (*col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least front feed slot 2*).

With respect to claim 14, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 19.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the print configuration design is selected from the group consisting of a color, an edge contour and a printed marking.

Fukano, working in the same field of endeavor, discloses wherein the print configuration design is an edge contour (*see at least notched edges of Fig. 12*).

This arrangement advantageously improves throughput and efficiency and allows desirable print results to be achieved without wasting printing forms as a result of printing on the wrong side (*col. 14, lines 35-42*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Fukano, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously improved throughput and efficiency and achieved desirable printing results without wasting printing forms.

With respect to claim 15, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 19, wherein the print medium is a paper strip (*col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 12 – see at least sheet-type print carrier 3*).

With respect to claim 17, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 19, wherein the print medium is provided with a human-readable marking or symbols identifying the specific content of the printout (*col. 5, lines 14-34 – see at least references "location", "date", and "signature"*).

6. **Claim 20** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 ("Mutz") in view of US 6,633,393 ("Fukano") and US 6,068,187 ("Momose '187").

With respect to claim 20, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 19.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the conveying drive is a stepping motor.

However, it is well known in the art to use stepping motors to convey a printing medium as they advantageously provide precision. This is evidenced by at least Momose '187 (*col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line 10 – see at least stepping motor*).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have used a stepping motor, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously provided precision.

7. **Claims 25 and 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 ("Mutz") in view of US 6,633,393 ("Fukano") and US 6,392,677 ("Lais").

With respect to claim 25, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 24.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the paper print medium is fanfold paper.

However, it is well known in the art that continuous feed paper is desirable for a tachograph. This is evidenced by at least Lais (*col. 1, lines 4-11*). Furthermore, it is well known in the art that paper on a roll isn't the only type of continuous feed paper available. It is well known in the art that continuous feed paper can be folded along perforations. This allows the paper to advantageously be stored in a box shape as opposed to a cylinder.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have used continuous paper such as continuous feed paper with folder perforations, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously allowed paper to be stored in a box shape as opposed to a cylinder.

With respect to claim 16, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 15.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the paper strip has at least one fold.

However, it is well known in the art that continuous feed paper is desirable for a tachograph. This is evidenced by at least Lais (*col. 1, lines 4-11*). Furthermore, it is well known in the art that paper on a roll isn't the only type of continuous feed paper available. It is well known in the art that continuous feed paper can be folded along perforations. This allows the paper to advantageously be stored in a box shape as opposed to a cylinder.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have used continuous paper such as continuous feed paper with folder perforations, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously allowed paper to be stored in a box shape as opposed to a cylinder.

8. Claims 4, 5, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,644,368 ("Mutz") in view of US 6,633,393 ("Fukano") and US 2001/0045452 ("Momose '452").

With respect to claim 4, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to 19, wherein the tachograph printer has an insertion opening, the conveying drive operates bidirectionally for conveying the print medium in and out of the tachograph printer and

which is activated in such a way that it begins when the print medium is placed into the insertion opening in a threading direction.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose '452. Momose '452 discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107]* - see *at least cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103]* – *the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserter (*paragraph [0167]* – see *at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose '452, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

With respect to claim 5, Mutz discloses the tachograph printer according to claim 4.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the printing unit prints on the print medium as it is conveyed in the threading direction or as it is conveyed in an output direction.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose '452. Momose '452 discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107]* - see *at least cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103]* – *the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserter (*paragraph [0167]* – see *at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose '452, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

With respect to claim 10, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 9.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the conveying device draws the print medium into the insertion opening and outputs the print medium therefrom after printing on the print medium.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose '452. Momose '452 discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107]* - see at least *cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103]* – *the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserter (*paragraph [0167]* – see at least *paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose '452, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

With respect to claim 11, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 27.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the printing unit is in a rest state and the insertion of the print medium transfers it into an operating state.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose '452. Momose '452 discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107]* - see at least *cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print

medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103] – the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserter (*paragraph [0167] – see at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose '452, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

With respect to claim 12, Mutz discloses the method according to claim 27.

Mutz fails to explicitly disclose wherein the print medium is fed to the printing unit in sections, and the feeding of each section initiates a conveying and printing operation, and the output of the printed section concludes the one conveying and printing operation.

However, it is well known in the art to convey a print medium bidirectionally and to begin conveyance when the print medium is put in. This is evidenced by at least Momose '452. Momose '452 discloses a conveyance drive (*paragraph [0107] - see at least cut-sheet form loading rollers 23 and transportation rollers 29*) that conveys a print medium bidirectionally (*paragraph [0103] – the print medium can be transported in forward and reverse directions*) and does so when the paper medium is inserter (*paragraph [0167] – see at least paper detector 24*). This advantageously eliminates the need for a print head to move along the length of the print medium and allows the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined the teachings of Momose '452, since doing so would have predictably and advantageously eliminated the need for a print head to move along the length of a print medium and allowed the same insertion slot to also be used as an ejection slot.

Response to Amendment

- 9.** Applicant's amended title, paragraph [0020] of the specification, and drawing filed 23 June 2010 are accepted.

Response to Arguments

- 10.** Applicant's arguments filed 23 June 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments on pages 9-11 regarding the rejections under 35 USC § 102 are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant argues on pages 11-12 that Fukano

...fails to teach or suggest determining a desired print configuration that will be used by the printing unit based upon reading of a print configuration design associated with the print medium, e.g., the printer reads print configuration (design) information from the print medium then prints data on the print medium based upon the read configuration design information. The present invention is distinctly different from the references relied upon because in the claimed invention the configuration design information is read from the print medium and used by the printer to automatically format what will be printed on the print medium. The references relied upon fail to teach or suggest this feature.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Fukano teaches that different print configurations will be necessary depending on whether it is the front or the back of a document that is being printed to (*col. 1, lines 8-21*). To determine what print configuration to use, Fukano discloses reading the print configuration design that can be markings such as bar codes or MICR (magnetic ink character recognition) (*col. 1, lines 43-49; col. 4, lines 39-45*) or physical changes to the medium such as notched edges (*see at least Fig. 12*).

Applicant argues on pages 13-15 that dependent claims are allowable by virtue of their dependency on allegedly allowable independent claims 19 and 27. Independent claims 19 and 27 are addressed in the aforementioned arguments.

Applicant's argues on page 15 that no motivation has been provided for combining references. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Each rejection in this Office Action includes motivations and rationales as to why such a combination would be obvious.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Guillermety whose telephone number is (571)270-5081. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs, 8:00AM - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fred Guillermety/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625